



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bibliotheca Chemico-Mathematica: A Catalogue of works in many tongues on Exact and Applied Science, With a Subject Index. Compiled and annotated by H. Z. and H. C. S. 2 Vols. London: Henry Sotheran and Co. 1921. Pp. 964.

These two volumes are made up of three booksellers' catalogues and an index. They form, however, one of the most available bibliographies of the history of modern science. In each of the three catalogues the authors are arranged in alphabetic order, and naturally a great many of the books entered are of little general interest. But the full and elaborate index, giving also the dates of the different works referred to, is a highly useful key to any one interested in the history of science. As is to be expected under the circumstances, the collection is very uneven as regards completeness. Thus there are no entries on Brownian movement, on the theory of quanta or on the algebra of logic, and almost nothing on statistical methods. Even when the bibliography is rather full as in theoretic physics, some of the very great and epoch-making treatises, like that of Bocovich which united the work of Newton and Leibniz, are missing. On other topics, however, such as the history of alchemy, the modern theory of solutions, or the history and theory of electricity, the lists are more adequate.

The many annotations to the titles, giving biographic and historical information, are as a rule rather interesting and lively. "The pioneers of science have never been of the dry as dust order." Students of philosophy may be surprised to learn that the common sense realism of Reid was originated by D. Abercrombie's *Academia Scientarum* or History of Natural Sciences, 1687; and it is instructive to learn that the authorship of a book on the *Varieties and Uncertainties of Artes and Sciences* landed Agrippa von Nettesheim in prison. As these annotations are generally based on secondary sources, some of them are rather misleading. Thus it is not true that the phlogiston theory retarded the progress of science. Like other false hypotheses it led to a great deal of new investigation and hence to the progress of science.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of these two volumes is the large number of plates giving portraits of the greatest of the scientists and facsimiles of the actual texts of the older books. The most cursory examination of these illustrations will give one an extraordinarily vivid sense of the intellectual vitality of previous centuries, and dispell the fashionable but foolish idea that before Darwin or Newton the world dwelt in utter scientific darkness.

The annotators, H. Zeitlinger and H. C. Sotheran, have not always made the most of their opportunities. I am tempted to give two instances. Colenso's *Algebra* is entered without noting that it

is by the same Bishop Colenso who upset the old biblical theology in England by his book on the Pentateuch in which his mathematical reasoning created great distress for those who regarded every story in the Bible as literally true. Colenso thus lost his bishopric on account of his mathematical proclivities. The second case is the entry of W. Carpenter's pamphlet on, *Water not Convex, the Earth not a Globe*, 1871. This is part of a famous law-suit. A wager having been made that the convexity of the earth could not be proved, Alfred Russell Wallace proceeded to do so with optical instruments on the water-level of a canal. The loser of the wager, however, refused to pay the bet. W. Carpenter was the dissenting referee, and his pamphlet illustrates how hard it is for experimental evidence to prevail over general convictions.

MORRIS R. COHEN.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

JOURNALS AND NEW BOOKS

JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY. September, 1921. *An Experimental and Statistical Study of Reading and Reading Tests*: ARTHUR I. GATES (303-314).—First of three installments. Conclusions and summary in the November issue. *Constancy of the Stanford-Binet I. Q. as shown by Retests*: HAROLD RUGG and CECILE COLLOTON (315-322).—An examination of the reports of Terman, Cuneo, Garrison, Poull, Wallin, Fermon and Stenquist was made. The conclusion drawn is that "much confidence can be put on a single I. Q. if the examination is made by experienced and well-trained examiners who use rigorously the standardized procedure for giving the test." Recent studies, except those of Fermon and Stenquist, closely confirm Terman in his earlier statements. The comparison of the findings of Fermon and Stenquist with those of other studies throws great doubt on the validity of the examining which was done by their workers. *Constancy of I. Q. in Mental Defectives, according to the Stanford Revision of Binet Tests*: LOUISE E. POULL (323-324).—126 inmates of the Children's Hospital on Randall's Island, New York City, were retested. The interval between the first and second tests varied from six months to three years; age of subjects from 4 to 28 years; the I. Q. of the first test varied from 20 to 90. The subjects as a group did not deteriorate, the average change was an increase of + 1.28. The question of the constancy of I. Q. is not settled. A large percentage of the cases shows variations which operate to change the classification and in cases above the obvious imbecile type, only observation and retesting can discover